

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

CHARLES SWIFT,)	4:14CV3185
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	MEMORANDUM
)	AND ORDER
MEGAN LARMIE, and PAULETTE)	
MERRELL,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

The above-captioned matter was provisionally filed on September 10, 2014. (Filing No. [1](#).) However, due to certain technical defects, the Complaint cannot be further processed. To assure further consideration of the Complaint, Plaintiff must correct the defect listed below. **FAILURE TO CORRECT THE DEFECT MAY RESULT IN DISMISSAL OF THE COMPLAINT.**

Plaintiff has failed to include the \$400.00 filing and administrative fees. Plaintiff has the choice of either tendering the \$400.00 fees to the Clerk of the Court or submitting a request to proceed in forma pauperis and an affidavit of poverty in support thereof. If Plaintiff chooses to do the latter, the enclosed pauper's forms should be completed and returned to this court.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff is directed to correct the above-listed technical defect in the Complaint within 30 days of the date of this Memorandum and Order.
2. Failure to comply as directed will result in dismissal of this case for want of prosecution.

3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to send to Plaintiff the Form AO240, Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Affidavit.

4. The Clerk of the Court is directed to set a pro se case management deadline in this matter with the following text: October 13, 2014: Check for MIFP or payment.

DATED this 11th day of September, 2014.

BY THE COURT:

s/ John M. Gerrard
United States District Judge

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.